

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JAGDISH MEHTA,

Case No.: 2:20-cv-01550-APG-DJA

## Plaintiff

# **Order Accepting Report and Recommendation and Denying Motion for Leave to Amend**

V

NUTRIBULLET, LLC, et al.,

[ECF Nos. 28, 31]

## Defendants

8 On January 5, 2021, Magistrate Judge Albregts recommended that I deny plaintiff  
9 Jagdish Mehta’s motion for leave to amend his complaint to add a new defendant who would  
10 destroy diversity jurisdiction if added. ECF No. 31. Mehta did not file an objection. Thus, I am  
11 not obligated to conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C.  
12 § 636(b)(1) (requiring district courts to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the  
13 report or specified proposed findings to which objection is made”); *United States v. Reyna-*  
14 *Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“the district judge must review the  
15 magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not  
16 otherwise” (emphasis in original)).

17 I THEREFORE ORDER that Magistrate Judge Albregts' report and recommendation  
18 (**ECF No. 31**) is accepted, and plaintiff Jagdish Mehta's motion for leave to amend (**ECF No.**  
19 **28**) is DENIED.

DATED this 2nd day of February, 2021.



---

ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE